

## **REMARKS**

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on November 26, 2008. Claims 22 – 40 are pending in the application. Claims 22 and 33 are currently amended. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter is added by the present amendments. Support for the present amendments can be found throughout the specification, for example on page 10, lines 9 – 23 and in Figs 5 and 7.

### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 22 – 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0186821 to Matson et al. (hereinafter “Matson”) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0160014 to Moss et al. (hereinafter “Moss”) and U.S. Patent No. 6,633,878 to Underwood (hereinafter “Underwood”). The Examiner maintained these rejections verbatim as they were presented in the Office Action dated 5/28/2008. In response to Applicant’s arguments that neither Matson nor Moss teaches any of the elements of independent claim 22, the Examiner noted that “[t]he claim language fails to provide any type of limitations [functions performed on the data] that restrict the type of data. Currently, the claimed limitations would operate in the same matter without regards to the data type.” (Office Action, page 11, lines 5 – 8). Responsive to the Examiner’s remarks, the present amendments clarify the nature of the data being processed (i.e. expense data) and provide more specific recitations of functions performed on the specific type of data.

Claim 22 as amended, which is representative in part of the other rejected claims recites:

22. A computer system including at least one processor and memory, for processing expense information, the system comprising:

a generic file parser adapted to receive said expense information from a plurality of expense data providers, wherein said expense information includes data in a plurality of formats, said expense information including invoice information and transaction information;

at least one specific parsing module corresponding to at least one of said plurality of formats, the specific parsing module(s) being adapted to overwrite functions of the generic file parser which are not suited for a format of said plurality of formats corresponding to the respective specific parsing modules;

at least one extension of a specific parsing module, the at least one extension being adapted to process specific fields of said expense information;

an invoice processing module adapted to receive said expense information and process said invoice information for invoicing; and

a balance processing module adapted to receive said expense information and process said transaction information for specific accounts.

Applicant respectfully submits that in light of the present amendments, each of the independent claims more clearly recites the specific nature of the expense information. The expense information is recited to specifically include invoice information and transaction information. That specific information is particularly processed, in the claims as amended, by processing modules that are operative upon the expense information and more particularly the invoice and transaction information. In light of the present amendment, Applicant respectfully reasserts the arguments over Matson, Moss and Underwood that were presented in Applicant's response to the May 28, 2008 Office Action. Applicants' claimed computer system and method involves expense information, and specifically expense information including invoice information processed for invoicing and transaction information for specific accounts. Such a system and method are clearly distinguishable from the system involving product data of Matson, and are not taught or suggested by any combination of Matson, Moss and/or Underwood. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 have been overcome. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

### CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons set forth above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are believed to be in order, and such action is hereby solicited. If any points remain an issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below. The Examiner is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned with any concerns in furtherance of the prosecution of the present application.

Please charge any deficiency as well as any other fee(s) which may become due at any time during the pendency of this application, or credit any overpayment of such fee(s) to Deposit Account No. 50-2896.

Respectfully submitted,

February 25, 2009

Dated:

/Brian L. Michaelis/

Brian L. Michaelis (Reg. No. 34,221)

Customer No. 71130

Attorney for Applicant(s)

SEYFARTH SHAW LLP

World Trade Center East

Two Seaport Lane, Suite 300

Boston, MA 02210

Tel: 617-946-4830

Fax: 617 946-4801

E-mail: [bosippto@seyfarth.com](mailto:bosippto@seyfarth.com)